arXiv:1702.02301v1 [math.CV] 8 Feb 2017

INVARIANCE OF DIEDERICH-FORNAESS INDEX

JIHUN YUM

Abstract. We show that the Diederich-Fornaess index of a domain in a Stein manifold is invariant under CR-diffeomorphisms. For this purpose we also improve CR-extension theorem.

1. Introduction

Let D be a relatively compact domain with C^k ($k \geq 1$) smooth boundary in a complex manifold M. A C^1 function ρ defined on a neighborhood U of $\overline{D}$ is called a (global) *defining function* of D if $D = \{z \in U : \rho(z) < 0\}$ and $d\rho(z) \neq 0$ for any $z \in \partial D$. In 1977, K. Diederich and J. E. Fornaess ([6]) showed that, if D is a pseudoconvex domain with C^2 boundary and M is a Stein manifold, there exist a positive constant η with $0 < \eta < 1$ and a defining function ρ such that $-(-\rho)^\eta$ is strictly plurisubharmonic on D. The supremum of all such constant η is called the *Diederich-Fornaess exponent* of ρ, denoted by $\eta_\rho(D)$; if no such η exists, we define $\eta_\rho(D) = 0$. The supremum of all Diederich-Fornaess exponents is called the *Diederich-Fornaess index* of D, denoted by $\eta(D)$. Note that a generalization to a bounded pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^n$ with Lipschitz boundary was studied by Harrington ([11]).

If D is a strongly pseudoconvex domain, then there is a strictly plurisubharmonic defining function. Consequently, $\eta(D) = 1$. But the converse is not true; Fornaess and Herbig ([9], [10]) showed that, if a C^∞ smooth relatively compact domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ admits a plurisubharmonic defining function, then $\eta(D) = 1$. In particular, the Thullen domain $\{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z|^2 + |w|^4 < 1\}$ has the Diederich-Fornaess index one, but it is clearly not strongly pseudoconvex. In fact, much more is known. For any sufficiently small $\eta > 0$ there exists a worm domain with Diederich-Fornaess index less than η ([7]). Recently, Krantz, Liu, and Peloso ([15]) showed that for a bounded pseudoconvex domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ with C^∞ smooth boundary, the Diederich-Fornaess index is one if the Levi-flat sets form a real curve transversal to the holomorphic tangent vector fields on ∂D.

Many significant far-reaching conclusions follow from the condition $\eta(D) > 0$. To cite only a few, we refer the reader to [2], [3], [5], [6], [12], [14], [17], and others.

On the other hand, the following natural question has been posed. We express our gratitude to M. Adachi as well as S. Yoo., for pointing out this question to us.

This research was supported by the SRC-GAIA (NRF-2011-0030044) through the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) funded by the Ministry of Education.

Question: *Is the Diederich-Fornaess index a biholomorphic or a CR invariant?*

Indeed, the main theorem of this article is as follows:

Theorem 1.1. *Let M_1, M_2 be Stein manifolds with dimension n ($n \geq 2$). Let $D_1 \subset M_1$, $D_2 \subset M_2$ be relatively compact domains with connected $C^k (k \geq 1)$ smooth boundaries. If there exists a C^k smooth CR-diffeomorphism $f : \partial D_1 \to \partial D_2$, then the Diederich-Fornaess indices of D_1 and D_2 are equal.*

There is a preceding result by M. Adachi ([1]) that, for a relatively compact domain in a complex manifold with C^∞ smooth Levi-flat boundary, the Diederich-Fornaess index is invariant under CR-diffeomorphisms.

Our proof of Theorem 1.1 requires the following modification of the theorem.

Theorem 1.2. *Let M_1, M_2 be Stein manifolds with dimension n ($n \geq 2$). Let $D_1 \subset M_1$, $D_2 \subset M_2$ be relatively compact domains with connected $C^k (k \geq 1)$ smooth boundaries. If there exists $C^s (1 \leq s \leq k)$ smooth CR-diffeomorphism $f : \partial D_1 \to \partial D_2$, then there exists the unique C^s smooth extension $F : \overline{D_1} \to \overline{D_2}$ such that $F|_{\partial D_1} = f$ and $F|_{D_1} : D_1 \to D_2$ is a biholomorphism.*

2. Improving CR-extension theorem

Let D be a domain in a complex manifold M, and $T_p(\partial D)$, T_pM be the *real tangent space* of ∂D, M at $p \in \partial D$, respectively. Then the *complexified tangent space of* T_pM, $\mathbb{C}T_pM := \mathbb{C} \otimes T_pM$, can be decomposed into the *holomorphic tangent space* $T_p^{(1,0)}M$ and *the anti-holomorphic tangent space* $T_p^{(0,1)}M$, i.e. $\mathbb{C}T_pM = T_p^{(1,0)}M \oplus T_p^{(0,1)}M$. Let $T_p^{(1,0)}(\partial D) := \mathbb{C}T_p(\partial D) \cap T_p^{(1,0)}M$ and $T_p^{(0,1)}(\partial D) := \mathbb{C}T_p(\partial D) \cap T_p^{(0,1)}M$.

Definition 2.1. A function $f \in C^1(\partial D)$ is called *a CR-function* on ∂D if for all $p \in \partial D$ one has

$$L(f) = 0 \qquad \text{for all } L \in T_p^{(0,1)}(\partial D).$$

Definition 2.2. Let D_1, D_2 be domains in complex manifolds M_1, M_2, respectively. A C^1 smooth map $F : \partial D_1 \to \partial D_2$ is called a *CR-map* if

$$F(T_p^{(0,1)}(\partial D_1)) \subset T_p^{(0,1)}(\partial D_2) \qquad \text{for all } p \in \partial D_1$$

A C^1 smooth map $F : \partial D_1 \to \partial D_2$ is called a *CR-diffeomorphism* if it is a CR-map and a diffeomorphism.

Definition 2.3. Let $H^{p,q}(M)$ be the (p, q)-th *Dolbeault cohomology of* M defined by

$$H^{p,q}(M) := \frac{\{\bar{\partial}\text{-closed (p,q)-form}\}}{\{\bar{\partial}\text{-exact (p,q)-form}\}}$$

Let $H_c^{p,q}(M)$ be the (p,q)-th *Dolbeault cohomology of M with compact support* defined by

$$H_c^{p,q}(M) := \frac{\{\bar{\partial}\text{-closed (p,q)-form with a compact support}\}}{\{\bar{\partial}\text{-exact (p,q)-form with a compact support}\}}$$

It is well known that for a bounded domain D in $\mathbb{C}^n (n \geq 2)$ with connected boundary, every CR-function $f : \partial D \to \mathbb{C}$ extends to $F : \overline{D} \to \mathbb{C}$ holomorphically ([19]). We modify it for a relatively compact domain in a Stein manifold.

Remark 2.4. The theorem above is widely known as Bochner-Hartogs theorem; but it was actually proven by Severi and Fichera ([8], [18]; see also [20]). We are indebted to M. Range for pointing this out.

Proposition 2.5 ([16])**.** *Let M be a non-compact complex manifold such that $H_c^{0,1}(M) = 0$. For any relatively compact domain $D \subset M$ with $C^k (k \geq 1)$ smooth boundary such that $M \setminus \overline{D}$ is connected and any CR function f of class $C^s (1 \leq s \leq k)$ on ∂D, there is a C^s smooth function F on $\overline{D}$, holomorphic on D, such that $F|_{\partial D} = f$.*

Lemma 2.6. *Let M be a connected smooth real manifold with dimension n $(n \geq 1)$, and $D \subset M$ be a domain with $C^k (k \geq 1)$ smooth boundary ∂D. If ∂D is connected, then $M \setminus \overline{D}$ is connected.*

Proof. Suppose that $M \setminus \overline{D}$ is disconnected. Then we may write $M \setminus \overline{D}$ as the disjoint union of two open sets $X, Y \subset M$. Then it is easy to see that $\partial(M \setminus \overline{D}) = \partial X \cup \partial Y$ and $\partial(M \setminus \overline{D}) = \partial D$. Since $\partial D = \partial X \cup \partial Y$ is connected by the assumption, $\partial X \cap \partial Y \neq \emptyset$. Let $p \in \partial X \cap \partial Y$. Since ∂D is the C^k smooth embedded submanifold of M, there is a smooth chart $\psi : U_p \to \mathbb{R}^n$ at p such that

- $\psi(p) = 0$,
- $\psi(U_p \cap D) = \psi(U_p) \cap \{(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_n < 0\}$,
- $\psi(U_p \cap \partial D) = \psi(U_p) \cap \{(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_n = 0\}$,

where U_p is an open neighborhood of p in M. Then $\psi(U_p \cap (M \setminus \overline{D})) = \psi(U_p) \cap \{(x_1, \cdots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_n > 0\}$ implies that $X \cap Y \neq \emptyset$, which is a contradiction. □

Theorem 2.7 (CR-extension theorem)**.** *Let M be a Stein manifold with dimension n $(n \geq 2)$. Let $D \subset M$ be a relatively compact domain with connected $C^k (k \geq 1)$ smooth boundary. If there exists a $C^s (1 \leq s \leq k)$ smooth CR-function $f : \partial D \to \mathbb{C}$, then there is a C^s smooth function F on $\overline{D}$, holomorphic on D, such that $F|_{\partial D} = f$.*

Proof. Since M is a Stein manifold, M is non-compact. By Serre Duality Theorem ([4]), $H_c^{0,1}(M)$ is dual to $H^{n,n-1}(M)$ and $H^{n,n-1}(M) = 0$ since M is Stein ([13]). Therefore $H_c^{0,1}(M) = 0$. By Lemma 2.6, the connectedness of the boundary ∂D implies the connectedness of $M \setminus \overline{D}$. Hence the theorem follows by Proposition 2.5. □

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.2.

2.1. **Proof of Theorem 1.2.** Since M_2 is a Stein manifold, there is an embedding of M_2 into $\mathbb{C}^N$ for some large $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and hence from now on we may regard M_2 as an embedded complex submanifold of $\mathbb{C}^N$. Therefore, we may write the given CR-diffeomorphism f as $f = (f_1, \cdots, f_N)$, where each $f_i : \partial D_1 \to \mathbb{C}$ $(i = 1, \cdots, N)$ is a CR-function. By CR-extension theorem(Theorem 2.7), f extends to $F : \overline{D_1} \to \mathbb{C}^N$ holomorphically.

First, we show that the image of F is in M_2 (i.e. $F(\overline{D_1}) \subset M_2$). Let $p \in \partial D_1, q \in \partial D_2$ with $f(p) = q$. Since M_2 is a Stein manifold, there exists a holomorphic map $\phi_q : M_2 \to \mathbb{C}^n$ such that ϕ_q is a local biholomorphism at q. Define $g_q : \partial D_1 \to \mathbb{C}^n$ by $g_q := \phi_q \circ f$. By CR-extension theorem(Theorem 2.7), g_q extends to $G_q : \overline{D_1} \to \mathbb{C}^n$ holomorphically. Let U_p be an open neighborhood of p in M_1 such that ϕ_q^{-1} is well-defined on $G_q(U_p \cap \overline{D_1})$. Define $H_{p=f^{-1}(q)} : U_p \cap \overline{D_1} \to M_2$ by $H_p := \phi_q^{-1} \circ G_q$. Patching H_p for each $p \in \partial D_1$, we may construct $H : U \cap \overline{D_1} \to M_2$, holomorphic on $U \cap D_1$, for some neighborhood U of ∂D_1. Since the holomorphic extension of CR-function is unique, H is well-defined and $F|_{U \cap \overline{D1}} = H$. Therefore $F(U \cap \overline{D_1}) \subset M_2$.

Now let $\tilde{p} \in U \cap D_1$, $p \in D_1$ and γ be a curve in D_1 joining $\tilde{p}$ and p. We choose $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and p_j, q_j, U_j, W_j, V_j $(j = 1, \cdots, m)$ as follows.

- $p_1 := \tilde{p}$, $p_m := p$, and $p_j \in \gamma$ for every j.
- $\{U_j\}_{j=1}^m$ is an open cover of γ with $p_j \in U_j$, and $U_j \cap U_{j+1} \neq \emptyset$ for every j.
- $q_j = F(p_j)$ for every j.
- W_j is a neighborhood of q_j in $\mathbb{C}^N$ such that $F(U_j) \subset W_j$ and $V_j := W_j \cap M_2$ is the zero set of holomorphic functions $\psi_\alpha^j : W_j \to \mathbb{C}$ $(\alpha = 1, \cdots, N-n)$ whenever V_j is non-empty for every j.

Since $(U \cap D_1) \cap U_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $(\psi_\alpha^1 \circ F)((U \cap D_1) \cap U_1) \equiv 0$, $(\psi_\alpha^1 \circ F)(U_1) \equiv 0$ for each $\alpha = 1, \cdots, N-n$, (i.e. $F(U_1) \subset M_2$). Similarly, since $(\psi_\alpha^2 \circ F)(U_1 \cap U_2) \equiv 0$, $(\psi_\alpha^2 \circ F)(U_2) \equiv 0$ for each $\alpha = 1, \cdots, N-n$, (i.e. $F(U_2) \subset M_2$). By induction, it follows that $F(U_m) \subset M_2$, which means $F(p) \in M_2$. Since $p \in D_1$ is arbitrary, $F(\overline{D_1}) \subset M_2$.



Fig. 1.

Next, we show that $F(D_1) = D_2$. Take a C^k smooth extension of F on an open neighborhood of $\overline{D_1}$, and denote it again by F. Then we proceed with the following three steps:

Step1) $det(J_{\mathbb{C}}F) \neq 0$ on ∂D_1 : Choose any point $p \in \partial D_1$ and let $q := F(p) \in \partial D_2$. Let $\{x_1, y_1, \cdots, x_n, y_n\}$ be a real coordinate system at p such that $\{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\big|_p, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_1}\big|_p, \cdots, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}\big|_p\}$ spans $T_p(\partial D_1)$. Let J_1 and J_2 be the complex structures of M_1 and M_2, respectively. Since F is holomorphic on D_1, $\bar{\partial}F = 0$ (i.e. $J_2 \circ dF = dF \circ J_1$) on $\overline{D_1}$. Consequently, $det(J_{\mathbb{R}}F) = |det(J_{\mathbb{C}}F)|^2$ holds at p. Therefore it is enough to show that $d_pF : T_pM_1 \to T_qM_2$ is $\mathbb{R}$-linear isomorphism. If $d_pF\big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_n}\big|_p\big) = 0$, then

$$d_pF\Big(-\frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}\Big|_p\Big) = d_pF\Big(J_1\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_n}\Big|_p\Big)\Big) = J_2 \circ d_pF\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_n}\Big|_p\Big) = 0,$$

which contradicts that $F|_{\partial D_1}$ is a diffeomorphism. Suppose that $d_pF\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_n}\Big|_p\Big) = w \neq 0 \in T_q(\partial D_2)$. Since $F|_{\partial D_1}$ is a diffeomorphism, there exists $v \in T_p(\partial D_1)$ such that $d_pF(v) = w$. Then

$$d_pF\Big(\operatorname{span}\Big\{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}\Big|_p, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_n}\Big|_p\Big\}\Big) = d_pF(\operatorname{span}\{v, J_1v\}) = \operatorname{span}\{w, J_2w\} \subset T_q(\partial D_2), \text{ and}$$

$$\operatorname{span}\Big\{\frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}\Big|_p, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_n}\Big|_p\Big\} \cap \operatorname{span}\{v, J_1v\} = \{0\}$$

imply that there exists $X \in \operatorname{span}\{v, J_1v\} \subset T_p(\partial D_1)$ such that $d_pF(X) = d_pF\big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}\big)$ with $X \neq \frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}$. This contradicts that $F|_{\partial D_1}$ is a diffeomorphism. Therefore $d_pF\big(\frac{\partial}{\partial y_n}\big|_p\big) \notin T_q(\partial D_2)$ and $d_pF : T_pM_1 \to T_qM_2$ is $\mathbb{R}$-linear isomorphism.

Step2) $det(J_{\mathbb{C}}F) \neq 0$ on D_1 : Suppose that $Z := \{z \in D_1 : det(J_{\mathbb{C}}F|_z) = 0\}$ is non-empty. Note that Z is a well-defined closed $(n-1)$-dimensional analytic variety in D_1. Since $det(J_{\mathbb{C}}F) \neq 0$ on ∂D_1 by (1), Z is a compact analytic variety in D_1. Since M_1 is Stein, Z should be finite (i.e. $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(Z) = 0$). This contradicts that $n \geq 2$.

Step3) $F(D_1) = D_2$: Since $det(J_{\mathbb{C}}F) \neq 0$ on D_1 by (2), $F|_{D_1}$ is a local biholomorphism, hence an open map. Therefore $F(\partial D_1) = \partial(F(D_1))$ holds so $F(D_1)$ is either D_2 or $M_2 \setminus \overline{D_2}$. Since $M_2 \setminus \overline{D_2}$ is non-compact, $F(D_1) = D_2$.

Now, we show that $F|_{D_1} : D_1 \to D_2$ is a biholomorphism. Since $f^{-1} : \partial D_2 \to \partial D_1$ is also a C^k smooth CR-diffeomorphism, by using the same argument as above, there exists the holomorphic extension G of f^{-1} such that $G(D_2) = D_1$. Now consider the map $G \circ F : \overline{D_1} \to \overline{D_1}$. Since $G \circ F$ is holomorphic on D_1 and $G \circ F|_{\partial D_1} = id_{\partial D_1}$, $G \circ F = id_{\overline{D_1}}$. Similarly, by using the same argument, $F \circ G = id_{\overline{D_2}}$. Therefore, $F|_{D_1}$ is a biholomorphism. □

3. **Invariance of Diederich-Fornaess index**

In Theorem 1.2, we extended the given CR-diffeomorphism $f : \partial D_1 \to \partial D_2$ to the interior of D_1 holomorphically. In this section, we extend it to the exterior of D_1

smoothly preserving the injectivity, and prove that the Diederich-Fornaess index is invariant under CR-diffeomorphisms.

Lemma 3.1. *Let M_1, M_2 be Stein manifolds with dimension n ($n \geq 2$). Let $D_1 \subset M_1$, $D_2 \subset M_2$ be relatively compact domains with connected $C^k (k \geq 1)$ smooth boundaries. If there exists a C^k smooth CR-diffeomorphism $f : \partial D_1 \to \partial D_2$, then there exist neighborhoods $U_1 \subset \overline{D_1}$, $U_2 \subset \overline{D_2}$, and a C^k smooth diffeomorphism $F : U_1 \to U_2$ such that $F|_{\partial D_1} = f$ and $F|_{D_1} : D_1 \to D_2$ is a biholomorphism.*

Proof. By Theorem 1.2, there exists the C^k smooth extension $F : \overline{D_1} \to \overline{D_2}$ such that $F|_{D_1} : D_1 \to D_2$ is a biholomorphism. Take a C^k smooth extension of F on an open neighborhood of $\overline{D_1}$, and denote it again by F. We show that there exist neighborhoods $U_1 \subset \overline{D_1}$, $U_2 \subset \overline{D_2}$ such that $F|_{U_1} : U_1 \to U_2$ is a diffeomorphism. In the proof of Theorem 1.2, we showed that $det(J_{\mathbb{R}} F|_p) \neq 0$ for all $p \in \partial D_1$. Hence F is a local diffeomorphism at every $p \in \partial D_1$.

Next, choose any Riemannian metric g on M_2. Define $\mathrm{dist}(w) : M_2 \to \mathbb{R}$ by the distance from w to ∂D_2 with respect to g. Let $V_\delta := \{w \in M_2 : \mathrm{dist}(w) < \delta\}$. Choose $\delta > 0$ so that for each $w \in V_\delta$ there exists the unique closed point in ∂D_2 from w. Define $\psi(w) : V_\delta \to \partial D_2$ by the closed point in ∂D_2 from w. For each $q \in \partial D_2$, define $V_q := \{w \in V_\delta : \psi(w) \in \partial D_2 \cap \mathbb{B}(q, \epsilon)\}$, where $\mathbb{B}(q, \epsilon)$ is the geodesic ball centered at q with radius $\epsilon > 0$. Let $U_{F^{-1}(q)}$ be the connected component of $F^{-1}(V_q)$ containing $F^{-1}(q)$. By letting $\epsilon > 0, \delta > 0$ small, if necessarily, $F|_{U_p} : U_p \to V_{F(p)}$ is injective for all $p \in \partial D_1$. Let $U := \bigcup_{p \in \partial D_1} U_p$ and $V := \bigcup_{q \in \partial D_2} V_q$, then U and V are neighborhoods of ∂D_1 and ∂D_2, respectively.

Now choose any $z_1, z_2 \in U \setminus \overline{D_1}$. Then $z_1 \in U_{p_1}$, $z_2 \in U_{p_2}$ for some $p_1, p_2 \in \partial D_1$. Let $q_1 := F(p_1), q_2 := F(p_2)$. Suppose that $w := F(z_1) = F(z_2) \in V_{q_1} \cap V_{q_2}$. If $p_1 = p_2$, then since $F|_{U_{p_1}} : U_{p_1} \to V_{q_1}$ is a diffeomorphism, $z_1 = z_2$. If $p_1 \neq p_2$, then the distance realizing geodesic γ joining w and $q_0 := \psi(w)$ is in $V_{q_1} \cap V_{q_2}$. Note that $(F|_{U_{p_1}})^{-1}(\gamma)$, $(F|_{U_{p_2}})^{-1}(\gamma)$ are curves joining $z_1, F^{-1}(q_0)$ and $z_2, F^{-1}(q_0)$, respectively. Therefore if $z_1 \neq z_2$, then $F|_{U_{p_1}} : U_{p_1} \to V_{q_1}$ is not injective near $F^{-1}(q_0)$, which is a contradiction. By letting $U_1 := U \cup D_1$, $U_2 := V \cup D_2$, Lemma 3.1 is proved. □



Fig. 2.

3.1. **Proof of Theorem 1.1.** By Lamma 3.1, there exists a C^k smooth diffeomorphism $F : U_1 \to U_2$ such that $F|_{\partial D_1} = f$ and $F|_{D_1} : D_1 \to D_2$ is a biholomorphism, where U_1 and U_2 are neighborhoods of $\overline{D_1}$ and $\overline{D_2}$, respectively. If $\eta(D_1)$ and $\eta(D_2)$ are both zero, then we are done. So we may assume that $\eta(D_2) > 0$. Let ρ_2 be a C^s $(1 \leq s \leq k)$ smooth defining function of D_2, then $\rho_1 := \rho_2 \circ F$ is a C^s smooth defining function of D_1. If $-(-\rho_2)^\eta$ is strictly plurisubharmonic on D_2 for some $0 < \eta \leq 1$, then $-(-(\rho_2 \circ F))^\eta$ is also strictly plurisubharmonic on D_1 with the same η because F is holomorphic on D_1. This implies that $\eta(D_1) \geq \eta$, and hence $\eta(D_1) \geq \eta(D_2)$. Therefore $\eta(D_1) > 0$. Applying the same argument as above with $F^{-1} : U_2 \to U_1$, one can see that $\eta(D_1) \leq \eta(D_2)$. Hence $\eta(D_1) = \eta(D_2)$. □

Acknowledgements: The author would like to express his deep gratitude to Professor Kang-Tae Kim for valuable guidance and encouragements, and to Professor R. M. Range for valuable advice. This work is part of author's Ph.D. dissertation at Pohang University of Science and Technology.

References

1. M. Adachi, *A CR proof for a global estimate of the Diederich-Fornaess index of Levi-flat real hypersurfaces*, Complex analysis and geometry, 41-48, Springer Proc. Math. Stat., **144**, Springer, Tokyo. (2015)
2. B. Berndtsson and P. Charpentier, *A Sobolev mapping property of the Bergman kernel*, Math. Z. **235**, no. 1, 1-10. (2000)
3. Z. Błocki, *The Bergman metric and the pluricomplex Green function*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **357**, no. 7, 2613-2625. (2005)
4. D. Chakrabarti and M.-C. Shaw, *L^2 Serre Duality on domains in complex manifolds and applications*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **364**, no. 7, 3529-3554. (2012)
5. B.-Y. Chen and S. Fu, *Comparison of the Bergman and Szegö kernels*, Adv. Math. **228**, no. 4, 2366-2384. (2011)
6. K. Diederich and J. Fornæss, *Pseudoconvex Domains: bounded strictly plurisubharmonic exhaustion functions*, Invent. Math. **39**, no. 2, 129-141. (1977)
7. K. Diederich and J. Fornæss, *Pseudoconvex Domains: an example with nontrivial neighborhood*, Math. Ann. **225**, no. 3, 275-292. (1997)
8. G. Fichera, *Caratterizzazione della traccia, sulla frontiera di un campo, di una funzione analitica di più variabili complesse*, Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei. Rend. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Nat. (8) **22** 706-715. (1957)
9. J. E. Fornæss and A. K. Herbig, *A note on plurisubharmonic defining functions in $\mathbb{C}^2$*, Math. Z. **257**, no. 4, 769-781. (2007)
10. J. E. Fornæss and A. K. Herbig, *A note on plurisubharmonic defining functions in $\mathbb{C}^n$*, Math. Ann. **342**, no. 4, 749-772. (2008)
11. P. S. Harrington, *The order of plurisubharmonicity on pseudoconvex domains with Lipschitz boundaries*, Math. Res. Lett. **15**, no. 3, 485-490. (2008)
12. P. S. Harrington, *Global regularity for the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann operator and bounded plurisubharmonic exhaustion functions*, Adv. Math. **228**, no. 4, 2522-2551. (2011)
13. L. Hörmander, *An introduction to complex analysis in several variables*, Third edition. North-Holland Mathematical Library, **7**. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam. (1990)
14. J. J. Kohn, *Quantitative estimates for global regularity*, Analysis and geometry in several complex variables (Katata, 1997), 97-128, Trends Math., Birkhuser Boston, Boston, MA. (1999)

15. S. G. Krantz, B. Liu and M. Peloso, *Geometric Analysis on the Diederich-Fornæss Index*, arXiv:1606.02343. (2016)
16. C. Laurent-Thiebaut, *Holomorphic function theory in several variables*, Universitext. Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London; EDP Sciences, Les Ulis, xiv+252 pp. (2011)
17. S. Pinton and G. Zampieri, *The Diederich-Fornaess index and the global regularity of the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem*, Math. Z. **276**, no. 1-2, 93-113. (2014)
18. F. Severi, *Risoluzione generale del problema di Dirichlet per le funzioni biarmoniche*, Rend. Reale Accad. Lincei **23** 795–804. (1931)
19. R. M. Range, *Holomorphic functions and integral representations in several complex variables*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **108**, Springer-Verlag, New York, (1986)
20. R. M. Range, *Extension phenomena in multidimensional complex analysis: correction of the historical record*, Math. Intelligencer **24**, no. 2, 4-12. (2002)

Department of Mathematics, Pohang University of Science and Technology, Pohang, 790-784, Republic of Korea

E-mail address: wadragon@postech.ac.kr